



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Assignee's Docket No.: 8446 )  
Group Art Unit: 2164 )  
Serial No.: 09/550,192 )  
Examiner: S. Wasylchak )  
Filing Date: April 17, 2000 )  
Title: Software Development )  
System Having Particular )  
Adaptability to )  
Financial Payment )  
Switches )

3624  
2/18/04  
A. Kelon  
1/29/04  
**RECEIVED**  
FEB 13 2004  
**GROUP 3600**

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that this document is addressed to Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, and will be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service, first class postage prepaid, on January 29, 2004.

Gregory A. Welte

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, DC 20232

Sir:

This Request is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on December 29, 2003. That Office Action asserts that a Corrected Amendment previously submitted by Applicants is non-responsive. Claims 1 - 13 are pending. Claims 1 - 7 were rejected in a previous Office Action. Claims 8 - 13 were added in a previous Amendment, and it appears that they have not been examined.

09/550,192  
Art Unit 3624  
8446.00

## MAJOR POINTS OF THIS REQUEST

### Point 1

The PTO asserted that a previous Amendment by Applicants ("Amendment A" herein) was not fully responsive, and listed two supposed defects.

Applicants submitted a Corrected Amendment, which corrected the two supposed defects.

The PTO now asserts that the Corrected Amendment is non-responsive, because it fails to address issues **which were not raised previously by the PTO** in its objection to Amendment A.

That is not allowed. The PTO cannot perpetually raise new issues for Applicants to address. That is piecemeal examination, which is specifically prohibited.

### Point 2

The PTO asserts that certain terms in claims 6 and 7 are unclear, and requests clarification. That is not allowed. The PTO may reject claims under section 112, but that has not been done. Or if it has been done, Applicants' previous Amendments have addressed the issue.

But Applicants are not required to submit "clarification." The claims speak for themselves, as supported by the rest of the patent application.

09/550,192  
Art Unit 3624  
8446.00

### Point 3

The PTO quarrels with the terms "software unit A," "software unit B," and the like in claims 6 and 7. Those terms are, in essence, no different from "first software unit," "second software unit," etc. The latter terms represent standard usage.

"A" "B" and the like are merely labels.

### Point 4

The PTO quarrels with "software unit A," in claims 6 and 7, but accepts "a group of type A modules" in claim 1. That is inconsistent. (This point is not elaborated below, because it is considered self-evident.)

*Software unit not in use during Dict*

### Point 5

The PTO asserts that "software unit A" etc. is not supported by the Specification. Such support is found specifically on page 33, and more generally on pages 31 - 33 (ie, the last three pages of the Specification, prior to the claims.)

*not true*